

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 19, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 11 are objected to because of the informalities. The Examiner's objection to claims 1 and 11 are respectfully traversed. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated "According to the specification, the amended claims 1 and 11, lines 7-8 (in claim 1) and lines 8-9 (in claims 11), "...a seal pattern on the over-coat layer, the seal pattern including a support member and entirely overlapping the black matrix:..." (in claim 1) and "... a seal pattern on the common electrode, the seal pattern including a support member and entirely overlapping the black matrix;..." should be "...a seal pattern on the over-coat layer, the seal pattern including a support member and partially overlapping the black matrix;..." and "...a seal pattern on the common electrode, the seal pattern including a support member and partially overlapping the black matrix;..." by citing the Figs. 5-8 and paragraph [0085], [0086], [0109] and [0110].

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. As shown in Figs. 5 and 7, the seal patterns 506 and 606 are entirely overlapping with the black matrix 502 and 702. Further, the specification discloses "In FIG. 5, the seal pattern 506 is formed on a structure that the black matrix 502 and the over-coat layer 504 are laminated. But, the IPS mode liquid crystal display panel according to one embodiment of the present invention can be also applied when the seal pattern 506 is formed so as to partially overlap with the black matrix 502" and "In the FIG. 7, the seal pattern 706 is formed on a structure so that the black matrix 702 and the over-coat layer 704 are laminated. But, the TN mode liquid crystal display panel according to the second embodiment of the present invention may be also applied when the seal pattern 706 is formed so as to partially overlap with the black matrix 702." The word 'can' and 'may' denotes the possibility that the seal pattern is partially overlapped with the black matrix. This means that the

seal pattern is formed at the region on the black matrix, but it is possible to form the seal pattern to be partially overlapped with the black matrix.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection of claims 1 and 11.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,739,880 to Suzuki et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,358,810 to Yoshino and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,388 to Aoya.

The rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-20 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a seal pattern on the over-coat layer, the seal pattern including a support member and is entirely overlapped with the black matrix” and “wherein a thickness (t) of the over-coat layer is $1.2\mu\text{m} < t < 2\mu\text{m}$ and $2\mu\text{m} < t < 5\mu\text{m}$, said thickness on the first substrate absorbing an external force, and preventing compression or depression of the black matrix.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned feature of the claimed invention.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Suzuki et al. teaches “a seal pattern (SL) on the overcoat layer, also on the common electrode (COM), and partially overlap the black matrix (BM) as shown in Fig. 5a.” However, the seal pattern of the claimed invention is entirely overlapped with the black matrix, not partially overlap with the black matrix. Thus, Suzuki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least “the seal pattern including a support member and entirely overlapping the black matrix.”

Further, in the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Yoshino teaches “the thickness of the overcoat layer (28) is $2.0\mu\text{m}$ so as to obtain a sufficient light-shielding effect.” However, the thickness (t) of the overcoat layer of the claimed invention is $1.2\mu\text{m} < t < 2\mu\text{m}$ and $2\mu\text{m} < t < 5\mu\text{m}$. Thus, Yoshino fails to teach or suggest at least “wherein a thickness(t) of the over-coat layer is $1.2\mu\text{m} < t < 2\mu\text{m}$ and $2\mu\text{m} < t < 5\mu\text{m}$, said thickness on the first substrate absorbing an external force, and preventing compression or depression of the black matrix.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-9, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 11 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a seal pattern on the common electrode, the seal pattern including a support member and is entirely overlapped with the black matrix” and “wherein thickness(t) of the over-coat layer is $1.2\mu\text{m} < t < 2\mu\text{m}$ and $2\mu\text{m} < t < 5\mu\text{m}$, said thickness on the first substrate absorbing an external force, and preventing compression or depression of the black matrix.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 11 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 11 are equally applicable to claims 1, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 12-20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Application No. 10/823,779

Docket No. 8733.1001.00-US

Amendment Response dated October 31, 2007

Response to Office Action dated October 19, 2007

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: October 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Eric Nuss
Registration No.: 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant